

FEB 12 2007

Serial No. 10/601,030
Attorney Docket No. RA-5482
Examiner Brian R. Peugh, Group Art Unit 2187

Office Action Response
September 6, 2006

Remarks

In the Office Action dated 11/13/2006 which was made Final ("Final Rejection"), Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, 19-24, 29-32 and 34-36 were rejected. Claims 3, 7-11, 17, 18, 25-28, 33 and 37 were objected to as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. The amendment set forth above amends the Claim to place them in condition for allowance in the manner indicated by the Examiner. It is therefore requested that this amendment be entered and the Claims be passed to issue.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, 19-24, 29-32, and 34-36 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,434,641 to Haupt et al. ("Haupt") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,973,550 to Rosenbluth et al. ("Rosenbluth") and U.S. Patent No. 6,546,465 to Bertone ("Bertone").

Claim 1 has been amended to include limitations of Claim 3 and intervening Claim 2. Claim 3 was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled.

Claims 4-11 depend directly or indirectly from Claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above in regards to Claim 1.

Independent Claim 12 has been amended to include limitations of dependent Claim 17 and intervening Claims 13 -16. Claim 17 is indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 12 is now in condition for allowance.

Serial No. 10/601,030
Attorney Docket No. RA-5482
Examiner Brian R. Peugh, Group Art Unit 2187

Office Action Response
September 6, 2006

Claims 13-17 have been cancelled.

Claim 18 has been amended to include all limitations of independent Claim 12 and intervening Claims 13 -16. Claim 18 is indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 18 is now in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 has been amended to depend from Claim 18, and is allowable for the reason set forth in regards to Claim 18.

Independent Claim 20 has been amended to include limitations of dependent Claim 25 and intervening Claims 21-24. Claim 25 is indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 20 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 21-25 have been cancelled.

Dependent Claim 26, which was indicated as being allowable, has been rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of base Claim 20, and intervening Claims 21-24. Claim 26 is therefore allowable as current presented.

Dependent Claim 27 has been amended to depend from Claim 20, and is therefore allowable for the reasons set forth in regards to Claim 20.

Dependent Claim 28, which was indicated as being allowable, has been rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of base Claim 20, and intervening Claims 21-23. Claim 28 is therefore allowable as current presented.

Independent Claim 29 has been amended to include all limitations of dependent Claim 33 and intervening Claims 30-32. Claim 33 was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 29 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 30-33 have been cancelled.

Serial No. 10/601,030
Attorney Docket No. RA-5482
Examiner Brian R. Peugh, Group Art Unit 2187

Office Action Response
September 6, 2006

Independent Claim 34 has been amended to include all limitations of dependent Claim 37 and intervening Claims 35-36. Claim 37 was indicated by the Examiner as being allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 34 is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 35-37 have been cancelled.

2. Claims 3, 7-11, 18, 18, 25-28, 33 and 37 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim, but are said to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. As discussed above, the amendment set forth above presents these Claims in independent form including all limitations of the base and intervening Claims. Therefore, it is requested that this amendment be entered, and the Claims be passed to issue.

FEB 12 2007

Serial No. 10/601,030
Attorney Docket No. RA-5482
Examiner Brian R. Peugh, Group Art Unit 2187

Office Action Response
September 6, 2006

Conclusion

In the Office Action dated November 13, 2006, Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 12-16, 19-24, 29-32 and 34-36 were rejected and Claims 3, 7-11, 17, 18, 25-28, 33 and 37 were objected to. In the Amendment set forth above, Claims 3, 7-11, 17, 18, 25-28, 33 and 37 are rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base and intervening Claims. It is requested that this amendment be entered, and all pending Claims be passed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the foregoing, a call to the undersigned is encouraged and welcomed.

Respectfully submitted,

 2/12/2007

Beth L. McMahon
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 41,987
Tele No. (651) 635-7893

Unisys Corporation
M.S. 4773
P.O. Box 64942
St. Paul, MN 55164-0942